

Project Coordination Team Meeting Summary April 9, 1997

The April meeting of the PCT was held April 9, 1997, at the Resources Building from 9:00 am until 1:00 pm.

Introduction

The meeting provided an update on work groups and technical teams as well as discussion on issue items.

Discussion of Agenda, no comments. Team was asked if they wanted to discuss BDAC meeting (4/10/97) and Ecosystem Round table. No comments were made on these items.

Item 1 - Issues

Transfers: Rick Soehren. The problem of perception needed to be addressed to facilitate discussion on the draft. The suggestion was made that a small group of CALFED people work on this with a consultant. If PCT group had any suggestions as to agency people who would like to participate in this process, please E-mail Rick or Mike Heaton.

Q. Is the group to be comprised of only agency people?

A. Yes, or (as per Lester) combine with group of technical people to form group.

- Discussion by Fish and Wildlife Service on transfers, analysis of historical uses. Suggestion made regarding studying maximum allowable under historical baseline for current Bay Delta Accord existing facilities.
- Is anything in Transfer Paper in conflict with Fish and Wildlife Service paper?
- No specific comment made, however, agencies questioned how to give red-flag review without draft of Transfer Paper. Chair acknowledged problem and reiterated Program's intent to provide adequate review time.
- Please forward, by E-mail, any questions and/or comments to Rick Soehren.
- Suggested policy items a transfer group might want to consider for discussion:
 - What baseline is being used. -How is water handled when it gets to the Delta. -Monitoring and augmentation of outflow. -1707 transfers. What has happened in the past, and how will it be monitored when the alternative is implemented.

Chairperson suggested need for CALFED to address these issues. Would Jerry Johns help put together comments regarding this discussion. Jerry: Yes. Jerry suggested CALFED identify a draft process to deal with issues raised by group. (Included in May packet)

Lester Snow: Need to address the issues in Governor Wilson's Water Policy. We need to have a CALFED workgroup to identify these concerns and work on details. Some interested parties and groups want it to move (B of A, for example) and some do not (Ag., Costa). The business communities and BDAC must work together. It is not simply an issue of the reviewing State Board's policy to issue transfers.

- Q. Delta vs. non-Delta issues. How is water handled when it gets to the delta, including use of state pumps, and 1707 transfer issues, and other broad issues. Will CALFED do all that?
- A. (Lester) Yes, Calfed has to do all that, also address San Joaquin water and other sources outside the Delta. We must address state-wide issues, not just moving water through the Delta. There is a need for a public forum to for discussion of these issues, which brings in all factions so no group is alienated.

Group was asked again to forward comments to Rick. If possible, outline of issues, and preview of process piece will be available for discussion at May meeting.

Lester asked the group whether the PCT meetings were meeting their needs, and requested group members to please advise if not. The need to identify and resolve what we (PCT) want to accomplish was reiterated, as well as the need to identify and address items and issues of concern to all participants. This item was further discussed at the end of the meeting.

Rick Woodard - Drafting San Joaquin Water Quality Issues

- Draft provided is re-draft of March 30, including revisions after comments. Please forward further comments by 4/16.
- Need for pro-activity on CALFED's part was concern at last meeting. Changes are in 2nd page bullets regarding leadership roles. Overall watershed approach, and other items expanded upon. If further comments reflect the need for substantive changes we will re-introduce, otherwise, we will move forward.
- The need for CALFED to articulate and formulate an approach to address the all of the concerns (not just those tied to EIR/EIS), of all agencies involved was reiterated.
- Question was raised as to why not include issues as actions in EIR? CALFED has ability to move process forward with action items as core of water quality program (such as land retirement).
- Reply (S. Yaeger), CALFED is including actions in water quality program that address issues in drainage on San Joaquin River basin. (The importance of PCT agreement with the policy paper would be to recognize that San Joaquin water quality issues are being addressed). Yaeger encouraged PCT to provide a unified front to move these identified issues forward.
- The need for a joint-understanding by participating agencies was identified.
- Rick Woodard explained that water quality issues are at program level, discussed what is going to happen, and reminded the group that the technical detail would be included in Phase III.

- Chairperson stated we need to include enough material with papers to support issues discussed.
- Suggestion was made to re-word bullets so stakeholders would not be scared off. "Assuming leadership..." too strong, suggest "CALFED will actively facilitate..." instead.
- Drainage issue. Generally acknowledged that Rainbow Report is out of date, need to touch bases with stakeholders in drainage.
- Group was again asked to forward comments to Rick Woodard by 4/16.

Item 2 Ecosystem Restoration Workshop

Dick Daniel provided an overview of the ER Workshop held 4/8. The Executive Summary to the Draft ERPP and 2 vision statements were released at the workshop. Explanation of time frames for the three volumes of the Draft ERPP were discussed, as well as the plan to incorporate any questions, comments, etc., into the ERPP draft volumes.

Dick urged the PCT to read the Executive Summary and vision plans and forward any comments ASAP, so they can be analyzed and included in the Draft volumes. This effort will enable the Draft ERPP document to address as many agency concerns as feasible, making it as final a document as possible and one all agencies will be comfortable with. Upon release of the Draft ERPP, there will be a 45 day public review period. Dick again urged all agencies to forward comments or meet with him to discuss ERPP Draft items ASAP.

Volume II of the Draft was identified as being most programmatic, and Volume III is the implementation volume. Daniel commented on difficulty of getting people to commit to identification related to the range of various issues. The suggestion was made to include peer review on the agenda for the May meeting.

At the request of the PCT, Dick Daniel agreed to provide an early review draft of Volume I on April 17. The draft will be discussed at an AERT meeting on April 21.

Item 3 Impact Analysis Approach

Workshop scheduled 4/29 Sacramento Convention Center, to discuss the approach to Impact Analysis.

Ray McDowell (653-9499) provided overview of Impact Analysis and Draft EIR/EIS Schedule (contained in packet distributed with agenda).

Discussion of time-lines and schedule.

Question was raised regarding No-Action Alternative, as well as how completion of models fits into schedule. Liaisons were requested to review the schedule and contact Ray regarding any changes.

Item 4 - Team Leader Presentations

1) Rick Woodard (team 4) Approach to Impact Analysis, Water Quality Program.

1. Revise W.Q. Action Statements to be compatible with the Programmatic EIR/EIS What/where/alternatives.
2. Establish Performance Targets and Environmental Targets for the actions.
3. Identify water quality areas (303d list - Clean Water Act Section)
4. Identify generalized impacts of the water quality actions.
5. Identify generalized impacts of other CALFED actions.

Kathy - Question - basecase ? - M&I concerns regarding source of supply.

2) Loren (team 6) - "Catch-all" group

Question - Frank, How do agencies receive team information since many of these items are being addressed elsewhere ?

Answer - Dealing directly with inquiries at this point.

Question - Can we sign up for team ?

Answer - Yes, we can establish points of contact for immediate review.

Jerry - Nature of "qualitative" vs. qualifyable ?

Clarify that some items are subjective.

Jerry - Fair amount of crossover in teams - take advantage of quantifying data from other teams to qualify items or Team 6 List.

3) Stein Buer - Team 2 - Surface Water & Hydrodynamics

- core group - consultants assigned technical areas
- large group invited to comment
- trying to make efficient review process by utilizing small working group.

Assessment Methods

- DWRSIM - Spreadsheet post analysis & evaluation
Delta Simulation Model
- output needed to write analysis as per schedule
- operating parameters need to be identified
- propose use DWRSIM to identify range of impacts for 16 alternatives
- group alternatives
- propose to exercise Delta simulation model thru range of hydrological conditions
- we have a range of options using DSMR - calibrated version as a check.
- will report on flows as contained within the system.

A long discussion ensued about the ranges and overlapping criteria. Who is doing criteria development? Stein - EPA comments, Ag groups, Bay Institute - trying to bring whole picture into focus by displaying ranges of criteria. Much work done in developing operating criteria and pre-feasibility studys will help clarify overlapping criteria.

Q Jerry. Can't we create one model to compare other to ?

A George (DWR) - Unrealistic - Since each alternative radically changes the criteria.

Judy Kelly - Can't resolve this today - maybe some of Jerry's suggestions can be discussed between now and next meeting.

Frank - suggest agencies work with Stein to analyze boundaries of criteria from perspective of environmental - also get input from ag & urban.

Steve - That's what Stein is doing.

George - not going to be an easy task - don't know if consensus can be attained.

- Suggest - Agency representatives going to Stein's groups should meet weekly to discuss criteria on nuances involved in formulating criteria.

Fish & Wildlife Impact Analysis Team

Bellory

- work together - meet weekly, have selected agency reps. (chart) pg 14 pkt Diagram provided specifies: Overall structure on how analysis will be conducted.
- Overview of overall structure - Fish & Wildlife Impact Analysis will be using:
 - common structure to both teams
 - side 2 diagram - details
 - further discussions of fisheries
 - further discussions of Fish & Wildlife

Q - Kathy Kelly - Have you checked your schedule with Stein's to coordinate ?

A - Bellory - Yes, discussed daily. Will be participating in Stein's team meeting to discuss impacts on Fish & Wildlife as Stein's group progresses ... to assist in mutual team progress.

Q - Frank Piccola - Wildlife impact mechanisms differ somewhat due to different needs of fish versus wildlife.

Judy Kelly - team will be providing updates at subsequent meetings.

Economic Impact Analysis - Zack McReynolds

Team recognizes areas needing attention - waiting for additional info.

- provided written overview
- only quantitative when necessary, can provide more detail as per feedback and requests of team

Q - Jim - What areas need more info. ?

A - No consensus of team yet what areas will require more qualitative info

Zack - e-mail list of group available for feedback

Q - Frank - Will this group capture data on land conversion possibilities ?

A - Yes.

Flood Control Impact Team - Lynn O'Leary

Team concentrate on Step 3 - Physical impacts on system, levee design - landside slope - etc.

(handout) waterside slope

levee stability

environmental response

levee maintenance

Step 4 - Possible mitigation measures

Q- Liz Howard - Identify CALFED Actions - Does this incorporate ?

Wendy - please send comments by 4/18.

- Aspects of Coordination - being addressed - weekly meetings with team leaders
- identify overlapping items

Item 5 - What's on your mind. How can meetings be bettered.

- Issues that haven't but need to be addressed ?
(no comment)

Carolyn - Meetings don't cover all we need to be doing - need extra time.

avoid situations where they should be flagging issues on info that hasn't been received yet.

Liz Howard - Reminder - previous handout on roles & responsibilities (PCT) - difficulty in keeping up on all info - time concerns

Judy Kelly - Try to use AD-HOC to resolve individual issues

Carolyn - have reports generated from Ad-hocs and distribute to PCT members.

Q - Are Ad-hocs for discussion or descision making ?

A - Judy Kelly - Just like PCT meetings.

Judy Kelly - *Need to know if needs of group are not being met.*

PCT team is for priority issues that need collective agency input and decision making.

Jean Elder - submitted comments weren't all responded to by CALFED. - CALFED needs to answer these concerns.

Judy Kelly - Agree

Jean Elder - Agencies need to be addressed as active entities in formulation process - not just advisors

Jerry - 4 hours for the meeting is enough - use more efficiently

Lester - We need to work through a reasonable operations regime.

Jerry - We need to give Stein some meaningful guidance.